

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

17 AUG -2 AM 10:45

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

BY *Am* CLERK

RYAN SISSOM,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

Case No. A-17-CA-631-SS

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS HIGH SCHOOL,
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, BETH COOPER,
STEVE ROSEN, and STEVE WALLS

Defendants.

ORDER

BE IT REMEMBERED on this day the Court reviewed the file in the above-styled cause, specifically "Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint" [#8 filed 07/05/2017] and Plaintiff's Response to the Motion [#9 filed 07/26/2017] and thereafter enters the following:

This lawsuit was filed in the Northern District of Texas on June 7, 2017, and was subsequently transferred to this docket. The original Complaint filed on June 7, 2017, is a rambling, argumentative and confusing document of 437 pages. Jurisdiction is allegedly based on federal question jurisdiction, RICO conspiracy and "supplement jurisdiction" because other counts arise out of the same nucleus of facts. The defendants are all sued in their official capacities and/or acting in their official capacities as entities of the State of Texas or employees of the State of Texas educational units.

It appears clear that under existing law all of the Defendants are exempt from damages due to their relationship to the State of Texas under the state's immunity protection.

The Plaintiff, Ryan Sissom, is basically complaining of being mistreated by lack of some information or alleged erroneous information concerning his progress in the University of Texas High School where he made application to go and was accepted. There is no legitimate pleading of any RICO conspiracy. Basically, the Plaintiff's allegations appear to be at most negligent allegations against the individual defendants during their conduct with Mr. Sissom and his efforts to fulfill and complete his education.

Ryan Sissom has filed this lawsuit pro se and is certainly to replead as instructed herein.

The defendant's Motions with regard to failure of pleading jurisdiction and specific causes of action against the individual defendants and institutions are GRANTED.

Ryan Sissom will have 20 days from the date of this order to file an Amended Complaint in an organized fashion, specifically stating the jurisdiction for this Court to act in this case and the specific causes of action against each of the defendants.

Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure states generally as follows:

A pleading that states a claim for relief must contain...a short and plain statement of the grounds for the Court's jurisdiction... a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief...a demand for the relief sought.

This means to establish jurisdiction as the federal Courts have limited jurisdiction the allegations must be clear for that determination. With regard to further pleading the Plaintiff must file allegations of specific factual allegations, which, if true, would result in the relief he seeks. *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544 (2007), *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009).

SIGNED this the 2nd day of August 2017.



UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE